



UCCS CAMPUS POLICY

Policy Title: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Policy Number: 200-001

Policy Functional Area: Academic

Effective: February 17, 2023

Approved by: Venkat Reddy, Chancellor

Responsible Vice Chancellor: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Office of Primary Responsibility: EVCAA

Policy Primary Contact: EVCAA

Supersedes: May 20, 2003; August 16, 2004; February 13, 2006; March 3, 2008; October 7, 2009, July 19, 2011

Last Reviewed/Updated: October 28, 2022

Applies to: Faculty

Reason for Policy: This policy specifies the procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates at the *primary unit level*, the *first level review*, and *second level review*.

I. INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the *Laws of the Regents* and University of Colorado *Administrative Policy Statements*, the University of Colorado Colorado Springs has adopted campus policies and procedures designed to provide a thorough and fair review of all tenure-track and tenured faculty subject to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

A. The policies and rules governing Promotion and Tenure matters at the University of Colorado are found in Administrative Policy Statement 1022, “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review” (Revised 7/1/2020); Regent Law 5.C, “Faculty Appointments and Tenure” (Revised 7/1/2020); and Regent Policies 5C, “Faculty Appointments” and 5.D “Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion” (Revised 7/1/2020). Post-tenure review is discussed in UCCS Policy 200-016 “Post-tenure Review.”

B. Purpose:

This policy statement is intended to provide additional procedural guidance, consistent with the Regent Laws and CU policies, for the review process at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. This policy specifies the procedures for reviewing and recommending candidates at the *first level review* and *second level review*. APS 1022 should be consulted for further detail of CU system requirements.

C. Procedures:

1. General Standards for Review

All candidates for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure will be reviewed in accordance with the general criteria for teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service specified in the CU Administrative Policy Statement 1022, "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review," and the specific criteria and standards defined in approved *primary unit's* "statement of criteria, standards, and evidence" developed in compliance with Regent Policy 5.D.3, "*Primary Unit* Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion." As acknowledged in system policy, the regents have approved the option for UCCS *primary unit* criteria to recognize professional practice as an additional criterion for consideration for tenure and promotion, with the reminder that for tenure, faculty must be deemed meritorious in all applicable categories and excellent in either teaching (or librarianship) or scholarly/creative work as defined by the *primary unit* criteria.

Under University policy, each *primary unit's* standards for review must be formally adopted under the unit's governance procedures and approved by the dean and executive vice chancellor for academic affairs (provost). Each statement must include:

- a. The standards prescribed by the Laws of the Regents as described in Regent Policy 5.D.3, "*Primary Unit* Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion" and APS 1022 "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review."
- b. A description of the procedures used by the unit when recommendations on personnel actions are developed.
- c. A description of the specific and other criteria that will be used to evaluate the candidate against the standards including the role, if any, that professional practice may play in evaluation.
- d. A description of the way in which the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) or differentiated workload will operate and be evaluated, if adopted by the *primary unit*.
- e. A description of the kind of evidence the unit will use to evaluate the candidate against the performance standards.
- f. The *primary unit* criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement for tenure and promotion cases that warrants the designations "meritorious" and "excellent" performance in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service as well as other activities relevant to the specific unit. However, reducing the inherent complexity of faculty activities to a strict formula is discouraged. For reappointment at the initial or comprehensive review, the criteria shall include a description of the level of achievement that warrants designations of "on track for tenure" and "not yet on track for tenure, but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections". It is at the discretion of the *primary unit* to determine if it is helpful to the candidate to also indicate whether "on track for tenure" is at a level of meritorious or excellent. A determination shall be made for each of the areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service (and, when indicated in *primary unit* criteria, other activities relevant to the specific unit. Failure to achieve these designated levels of performance in any reappointment, promotion or tenure review constitutes unsatisfactory performance.

At the University of Colorado Colorado Springs, the *primary unit* criteria must address promotion to professor as well as evaluation of pre-tenure faculty, ensuring that criteria, procedures, and evidence are used to evaluate the candidate against the standard for promotion established in University policy.

All *primary units* must maintain records of approval of the *primary unit* statement of criteria, standards, and evidence as well as written records of formal faculty decisions regarding how *primary unit evaluation committees* will be constructed.

2. Faculty Responsibility Statement and Differentiated Workloads

The Colorado Springs campus has approved the use of the Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) in faculty evaluation for tenure and promotion. If, for example, the *primary unit* decides to adopt a standard distribution of responsibilities for all faculty, that must be clearly stated. Likewise, if the *primary unit* adopts a standard distribution of responsibilities for pre-tenure faculty, but allows differential FRSs to be employed post-tenure, the allowable parameters of difference and the interaction between an individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion to full professor must be clearly stated. Finally, if a *primary unit* decides to allow faculty at all levels to operate under differential FRSs, the allowable distributions across the areas of review at each level of seniority and the interaction between the individual faculty member's FRS and the criteria for promotion and tenure must be clearly stated. The FRS must be implemented in such a way that the regental standard of "demonstrated excellence in either teaching (or librarianship, or scholarly/creative work" is met.

Those departments adopting professional practice as a category for evaluation must be especially clear about what activities fall under not only professional practice, but teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work and leadership/service as well. Some activities previously considered under one of the existing categories may now be deemed more appropriate for consideration as professional practice. The regents' policy makes clear that all tenured faculty must have demonstrated significant accomplishments in both teaching (or librarianship) and scholarly/creative work, and that excellence must be demonstrated in one or the other, but departments have discretion in defining the scope of each and in defining meritorious and excellent performance in each. Departments need to keep in mind that the evaluative weight and the actual workload associated with each category may differ, and that excellence is a function of quality as well as quantity.

Documentation of Faculty Responsibility Statements and differentiated workloads should be included in the dossier as discussed in II.C.1.d. *Primary unit* criteria shall address how these deviations from standard workloads will be considered in terms of the personnel actions.. The *primary unit evaluation committee* will document in their letter how the faculty member's workload was evaluated. The minimum standards for tenure stated in Regent Law (meritorious performance in all areas and excellent performance in teaching or scholarly/creative work) must still be met even when a faculty member has been on a workload which deviates from the standard workload. Promotion to full professor allows some greater flexibility in taking the workload into account.

3. Faculty Rights and Privileges

A candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure has specific rights and privileges in the review process. These are described in Administrative Policy Statement 1022, "Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review"

(Revised 7/1/2020); Regent Law 5.C, "Faculty Appointments and Tenure" (Revised 7/1/2020); and Regent Policies 5C, "Faculty Appointments" and 5.D "Reappointment (to a tenure-track position), Tenure, and Promotion" (Revised 7/1/2020).

4. Schedule for Reviews

Appointment Length. Tenure-track appointments are normally for an initial three-year period, followed by two 2-year reappointments as an assistant professor.

Exceptions to this pattern of appointments could include:

- a. **Starting without the terminal degree.** In cases in which an individual is hired before their terminal degree is awarded (such as cases where the dissertation is not yet complete), the initial appointment will be as an instructor, with change to assistant professor rank when the doctorate is granted. Time in the instructor rank is not applicable as credit towards tenure; the tenure clock begins only with appointment to the assistant professor rank.
- b. **Arriving with prior academic experience.** Typically, up to three years of full-time service in the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor at other institutions may be included in the probationary period. Each year of credit granted reduces the probationary period by one year. The amount of credit and the timeline for reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews must appear in the letter of offer and is subject to approval by the provost. In other circumstances, such as employment of a faculty member who has already achieved tenure at another institution, modified schedules for tenure reviews must be documented in conjunction with original letters of offer. In addition, under special circumstances, a faculty member may be hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure based on academic experience and accomplishments at other institutions. Finally, the hiring unit may propose, and the campus may approve, letters of offer that include tenure subject to Regent approval.
- c. Being appointed **mid-year.** An individual's tenure clock begins at the time of the initial appointment. If the initial appointment begins after the beginning of the Fall semester, the tenure clock will start at the beginning of the next academic year.

5. Timing of Reviews

Reviews normally take place in the next-to-last year of the current appointment, except for tenure reviews, which occur in the final year of the appointment.

For those faculty on the normal contract schedule (3-year initial contract, 2-year extension, followed by another 2-year extension), the initial reappointment review is conducted at the beginning of the second year, and the comprehensive reappointment review is conducted in the fourth year. If the initial reappointment review is unsatisfactory, the third year is a contracted terminal year. If the comprehensive reappointment review is unsatisfactory, the fifth year is a contracted terminal year.

Tenure rules provide for review in the seventh year and, if tenure is approved, the award of tenure is at the beginning of the eighth year. For candidates denied tenure, the eighth year is a nonrenewable one-year contracted terminal appointment.

The tenure clock may be stopped for various reasons with the approval of the dean and the chancellor (or the chancellor's designee). Some examples of leave which would include a tenure

clock stop are provided in APS 1022. The expectations of the candidate following a tenure clock stop shall not be greater than those if the candidate had not stopped the tenure clock.

6. Failure to Submit a Dossier

A faculty member who declines or fails to submit a dossier for review at the scheduled time as established by the *primary unit* committee or college is deemed not to have applied for reappointment or tenure. In this situation, the faculty member's appointment terminates at the end of the existing contract. *There is no terminal year beyond the end of the existing contract.*

7. Termination of review

Once a dossier is submitted, the review process will continue unless the dossier is withdrawn by the candidate. For initial, comprehensive, and tenure reviews, withdrawal of the dossier is equivalent to failing to submit a dossier.

8. Request for Early Consideration for Tenure

Tenure-track faculty members must have undergone comprehensive reappointment review and will typically have been appointed on the tenure-track at UCCS for at least three years before they may apply for tenure consideration. The comprehensive reappointment review and consideration for tenure may not occur in the same academic year. At the request of the candidate and with the approval of the *primary unit* and dean, the comprehensive reappointment review may be conducted earlier than originally scheduled. A *primary unit evaluation committee* or dean may require that a faculty member wait until the seventh year to apply for tenure. The dean may seek an exception to the three-year expectation by approval from the provost and the chancellor. Reasons for granting an exception include if the faculty member has already been granted tenure at another institution or for whom specific alternative provisions are detailed in the letter of appointment.

9. Transfer of tenure

Regent Article 5 recognizes that tenure is granted by the University. If a faculty member seeks to transfer their University of Colorado tenure from one University of Colorado *primary unit* to another (within a college/school or in different colleges/schools), the transfer of tenure must be approved by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the receiving *primary unit* and by the dean of the receiving college/school. *Primary units* may include additional requirements for the transfer of tenure in their approved *primary unit* criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

D. Deadlines

Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the Office of the provost no later than the first of February or a different date determined by the provost office. College and school deadlines must be sufficiently early in the fall semester to meet this deadline.

E. Specific Standards for Review

1. Tenure

Tenure may be awarded only for demonstrated meritorious performance in each of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if included in the *primary unit's*

criteria), and leadership/service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching (or librarianship) or scholarly/creative work.

Tenure-track faculty members will typically have been appointed on the tenure track at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs for at least three years and must have undergone comprehensive reappointment review before they may apply for tenure consideration. Initial appointment as an associate professor or professor without tenure will substitute for the comprehensive review only if a positive recommendation results from a review of the candidate's credentials by the committees and officers involved in the normal promotion and tenure review process. The candidate's dossier must include the relevant documentation in the initial letter of appointment in the latter cases.

2. Early Tenure

While the same overall criteria for tenure and promotion apply in cases of early consideration for tenure, department chairs and mentors have a responsibility to advise tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early tenure. A faculty member who is not granted early tenure continues on their original schedule for tenure review. The year following a denial of early tenure is not a terminal year.

3. Promotion

Associate Professor: The review for promotion to associate professor occurs at the same time as the tenure review. There is no consideration for promotion to associate professor separate from consideration for tenure unless warranted by special circumstances. When these special circumstances exist, the candidate will be evaluated based on the criteria for appointment of associate professors that are defined in University policy.

Professor: Under University policy, promotion to professor requires a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and a record since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service.

F. Dossiers

1. Electronic Dossier

An electronic dossier template is prepared by the provost's office and sent to the candidate. It includes the documents required to be uploaded by the candidate; the timeline for the review; and the participants at each campus level of review – candidate, *primary unit evaluation committee*, chair (if applicable), dean's *review committee*, dean, vice chancellor's *review committee* (if applicable), provost, and chancellor (if applicable).

a. Each electronic dossier contains the following material:

- i. Materials typically supplied by the provost's office or college:
 - a. Department's/College's RPT Criteria

- b. Candidate's Criteria Choice Document (used only in Initial, Comprehensive, and promotion to associate professor/tenure reviews; not applicable to promotion to full professor)
 - c. Current and previous Faculty Responsibility Statements/differentiated workloads (or standard responsibility distribution statement as provided by *primary unit* criteria) (if applicable)
 - ii. Materials supplied by the candidate as discussed in section II.F.2.
- b. Adding material during the process. A candidate shall be entitled to submit any material or information they believe will be helpful in evaluating their case at the first, second and third review stages. If significant material is added to the dossier or information that could have changed the outcome of the *primary unit evaluation committee* or subsequent levels of review is provided at any stage in the review process beyond the *primary unit* level, the case must be reconsidered by all levels of review. The determination of whether the material could have changed the outcome of the review at each level will be made by each chair responsible for making recommendations, in consultation with the other members of the *appropriate review committee*. This determination shall be in writing.
- c. Return of dossiers. The electronic dossier, minus the external letters and any other confidential materials, will be made available to the candidate at the completion of the RPT process.

2. Candidate's Responsibility

Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure are responsible for ensuring that the teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service sections of their dossiers are complete, accurate, and properly organized, and that they present the strongest possible case. While the candidate may provide additional significant material about their entire career, the material should focus on activities since the date of the last appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

The candidate provides the following information in the dossier:

- a. Current Vita. The vita must be current to the date of submission.
- b. Executive Summary. This is a two-to-three-page summary statement of the candidate's entire record, dossier, and plans for the future, including responses to any suggestions and/or recommendations made in prior RPT reviews. Candidate is expected to address teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service areas.
- c. Teaching or Librarianship. Material related to teaching must include a statement and supporting documents. The statement shall include: teaching philosophy and changes in teaching methods over the years, the history of courses taught, the number of students in classes, work with or mentoring of students outside the classroom, methods used to review teaching, grading practices, a summary of the student evaluations, and a response to the evaluation data. In addition to the statement, submitted materials must include multiple means of evaluating teaching for the review period. FCQs must be included as one of the multiple means. All FCQs since starting at UCCS are required for initial, comprehensive, and tenure reviews. All FCQs since tenure are required for review for promotion to full professor. Library faculty shall include a

statement and materials related to the practice of librarianship and work with students in that context as applicable.

- d. Scholarly/Creative Work. Material related to scholarly/creative work must include a statement describing the focus of the candidate's research/scholarly/creative work to date, anticipated future directions, and other materials related to the *primary unit* criteria. The candidate should explain the extent of the candidate's contribution when there are co-authors. For each refereed publication, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide an indication of the peer review process and selectivity level. In the statement, the candidate may provide justification for the selection of journals or publication outlet.
- e. Leadership and Service. Material related to leadership and service must include a statement describing all significant professional service to any organization including the University, city, state, region, nation, international, and/or to professional associations. In addition to the statement other relevant materials may be included.
- f. Professional Practice (if included in the *primary unit's* criteria and is part of a faculty member's FRS). Material related to professional practice must include a statement describing professional practice activities and development, and may include any evaluations or other documentation of the effectiveness of practice.
- g. Supporting material. Candidates are entitled to submit to the *primary unit evaluation committee* any relevant material or information that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. This may include focus areas related to UCCS core values such as diversity, equity and inclusion. Dossiers should be accompanied by supporting materials such as books, monographs, refereed journal articles, photographs of works of art, etc.

3. Reviewer Responsibilities

A faculty member may speak to and vote only at one level on a case undergoing review and may not be present during discussion and vote on the case at any other levels of the process. For example, a faculty member serving on a *review committee* at any other level beyond the *primary unit evaluation committee*, who votes on a case in their *primary unit*, may not be present during and must not contribute in any way to the discussion, and must abstain from voting on the case when it is considered by the *review committee* beyond the *primary unit*. **An exception is that faculty serving on the *primary unit evaluation committee* may also vote with the *primary unit* faculty if the *primary unit* conducts a vote of the faculty.** If the faculty member does not participate in the *primary unit* discussion and vote on the case, the faculty member may participate in the discussion and vote on the case at one subsequent level. **All participants in *evaluation committees* are responsible for maintaining strict confidentiality regarding the content of committee deliberations and external reviewers' identities. No person may advocate to a reviewer for a particular outcome of an evaluation.**

- a. *Primary Unit's* Responsibility (beginning of *first level review*)
 - i. *Primary unit chair and primary unit evaluation committee chair*. Every candidate must have a *primary unit evaluation committee* consisting of at least three members of the candidate's *primary unit* or related *primary units* if the *primary unit* is too small. The chair of the *primary unit* is responsible for providing candidates with a copy of the *primary unit's* "statement of criteria, standards, and evidence" during the first semester of appointment.

The chair of the *primary unit evaluation committee* is responsible for ensuring that dossiers are reviewed and submitted to the college, school or library dean's office in a timely fashion, and for re-reviewing cases, if required.

- ii. The chair of the *primary unit evaluation committee* shall, in cooperation with the dean's office and the provost's office, provide the following materials in the dossier (in conjunction with the college/school/library HR admin):
 - a) Previous RPT and Personnel Action Letters. If the candidate has previously undergone RPT review, copies of the following must be included: (1) previous *primary unit evaluation committee* evaluations, votes, and recommendations (to include areas to be strengthened as identified during previous reviews); (2) previous chair of the department evaluations, if applicable, (3) previous dean's *review committee* review evaluations, votes, and recommendations; (4) previous dean's evaluations and recommendations; (5) previous vice chancellor *review committee's* letters; and (6) previous provost's letters.
 - b) Letters of Evaluation from External Reviewers. A minimum of three external evaluation letters must be included for promotion to associate professor, tenure, and for promotion to full professor. All letters that are received must be included in the dossier. *Primary unit* criteria may require a greater number of letters.

For a comprehensive review, the use of external letters is at the discretion of the *primary unit* and shall be stated in the *Primary Unit Criteria*. If the *Primary Unit Criteria* do not specify the details of the use of external reviewers, then the processes described here will be used including a minimum of three letters.

When external letters of evaluation are required, the *primary unit evaluation committee* chair or the dean, not the candidate, must solicit external letters of evaluation. Several more evaluators than the minimum required should be contacted to determine their willingness to serve to ensure the requisite number of letters are received. It is the responsibility of the *primary unit evaluation committee* chair to ensure the requisite number of letters are received. All external evaluation letters received in response to requests for external evaluations must be included in the dossier. The request letters sent to the external reviewers should include a request from the reviewers for their vita so that the various RPT committee members may assess the external reviewer's expertise in evaluating the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to clearly specify their relationship to the solicited external reviewers (e.g., co-author, etc.).

External reviewers are expected to give an "arm's length objective" review. The solicitation of co-authors, mentors, and former colleagues must not constitute a majority of the solicitation letters. Care must be taken to exclude any reviewers whose evaluations might constitute a conflict of interest.

Although procedures vary among colleges, schools, and the library, the candidate may suggest potential external evaluators, as well as specific scholars to exclude from consideration because their evaluations may be prejudiced against the candidate. Persons recommended by the candidate to write evaluation letters must

not be relatives or current or former students. Before the *primary unit evaluation committee* sends letters requesting the external evaluations, the dean of the college, school, or library must approve the list of evaluators. The *primary unit evaluation committee* must include in the candidate's dossier a copy of the letter requesting evaluation letters and any additional instructions sent to external reviewers. The chair of the *primary unit evaluation committee* must consult the dean's office for the format for letters to external evaluators for comprehensive review. With the candidate's materials, the external reviewers shall be sent an institutional description, *primary unit* criteria, any applicable FRS, and a clarification of whether this is a comprehensive or a tenure review if needed.

The names and institutional affiliations of external reviewers and their letters of evaluation are confidential, must not be divulged or provided to the candidate, and are retained electronically. A summary, redacted to preserve the anonymity of the reviewers, of the content of evaluation letters must be made available to the candidate. This summary, including representative quotations from the external letters, may be provided within the *primary unit* letter. The *primary unit evaluation committee* letter and all subsequent letters should not supply any information that would serve to identify those individuals who have written external letters evaluating the candidate.

iii. *Primary Unit Evaluation Committee Summary, Vote, and Recommendation*

a) Each *primary unit* will form a *primary unit evaluation committee* following its own internal written procedures in compliance with college or University guidelines. In the absence of written *primary unit* procedures, college or University guidelines will be followed. The *primary unit evaluation committee* provides a thorough and careful evaluation of the candidate in the four areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if included in the *primary unit's* criteria), and leadership and service. The *primary unit evaluation committee's* role is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the established standards and criteria, especially with regard to the interaction between the candidate's Faculty Responsibility Statement (if applicable) and the criteria and standards in the *primary unit*. Negative comments or votes must be explained. A statement such as "we do/do not recommend reappointment" is not sufficient. The *primary unit evaluation committee's* letter must explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation. The *primary unit evaluation committee's* letter must specifically address how the candidate's record of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service meets the *primary unit* standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in University policy, keeping in mind that the faculty on subsequent level committees are further removed from the candidate's area of specialization. The letter also should provide the *primary unit evaluation committee's* assessment of the impact of the individual's scholarly/creative work products and publication outlets. Under Administrative Policy Statement 1022, "The merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for the award of tenure. The program requirements of the unit shall be considered at the time of appointment and reappointment." For the purposes of this campus policy, this means that members of the *primary unit* may rely on their own direct knowledge of the candidate's actions, over and above those documented in the dossier, only when those actions affect

200-001 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

whether or not the candidate meets the *primary unit* criteria for teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service. It also means that *primary units* may take the degree to which the candidate's expertise and contributions meet the unit's specific needs into account when making recommendations regarding reappointment, but not in making recommendations regarding tenure. Any consideration of the program requirements described here must be documented in the *primary unit evaluation committee* letter.

- b) Following the approved procedures of the *primary unit*, the *primary unit evaluation committee* must vote on the action under consideration, prepare a summary of the evaluation by the *primary unit evaluation committee* and a recommendation for action, and include this information in the dossier. For assistant professors, the issue of tenure and promotion is one action requiring one decision. For associate professors without tenure, the issue of tenure is one action requiring one decision.
- c) The vote must specify the number of faculty members present and the actual vote (e.g., six of eight faculty members were present and voted 4-2 in favor of promotion and tenure). A unanimous vote is not required, but a majority of the committee is required for a positive recommendation. Split votes must be addressed, with the inclusion of an explanation of the reasons for the minority votes. Those voting in the minority may write a separate report that describes their evaluation of the candidate's dossier and the points of disagreement with the committee majority.
- d) *Primary units* vary in their written procedures on the role of the *primary unit evaluation committee* within the department. Nothing in this document shall be construed as preventing a department from determining its own internal processes, consistent with the laws of the Regents and applicable administrative policy. Any formal votes conducted among faculty who did not participate in the *primary unit evaluation committee's* deliberations also shall be reported in the *primary unit's* recommendation letter.

iv. Primary Unit Faculty

The faculty of the *primary unit* shall vote as specified in APS 1022 section VII.C.1.b. This step may be omitted if the faculty of the *primary unit* have previously voted and approved leaving out this step.

v. Department Chair Summary and Recommendation (when the department chair is not serving on the *primary unit evaluation committee* or on a different level *review committee*)

The department chair provides a separate evaluation if the department chair is not serving on the *primary unit evaluation committee* or on a different level *review committee*. The department chair provides a thorough, careful, and independent evaluation of the candidate in the four areas of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service. The department chair's role also is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the established standards and criteria. Negative recommendations must be explained. A statement such as "I do/do not recommend reappointment" alone is not sufficient. The department chair's letter must explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation. The department chair's letter must specifically address how the

candidate's record of teaching (or librarianship), scholarly/creative work, professional practice (if applicable), and leadership and service meets the *primary unit* standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in University policy, keeping in mind that the faculty on subsequent level committees are further removed from the candidate's area of specialization.

- b. **Dean's Responsibility.** The dean of the college, school, or library shall provide the following information:
- i. **Dean's Review Committee Summary, Vote, and Recommendation.** The appropriate body, as defined in the bylaws of the college, school, or library, shall review the candidate's dossier, votes on the proposed action, and forwards to the dean a review summary and a recommendation for action. When possible, the committee will include broad socio-demographic representation. The dean's *review committee* shall make a thorough assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in relation to the *primary unit* standards and criteria and the criteria and standards defined in University policy. The vote must specify the number of members present and the actual vote (e.g., all three members were present and voted unanimously in favor of promotion and tenure). A unanimous vote is not required. Split votes must be addressed, with the inclusion of an explanation of the reasons for the minority votes. Those voting in the minority may write a separate report that describes their evaluation of the candidate's dossier and the points of disagreement with the committee majority.
 - ii. **Dean's Role, Responsibilities, and Recommendation.** The dean shall prepare a recommendation for action that discusses the earlier reviews (*primary unit evaluation committee*, *primary unit* faculty (if applicable), department chair [if applicable], and dean's *review committee*) and points out areas of concern or disagreement.

If the dean's *review committee* and/or the dean disagree with the recommendation of the *primary unit evaluation committee* and/or the recommendation of the department chair (if applicable), the dean must provide a written statement about the nature of the disagreement to the chair of the *primary unit evaluation committee* and the department chair. The *primary unit evaluation committee* shall then reconsider its original recommendation and report the reconsidered judgment to the dean and the dean's *review committee* in writing.

Where differences of opinion exist among the *primary unit evaluation committee*, the department chair (if applicable), the dean's *review committee*, and/or dean, a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and rationales for the recommendations must be included in the dean's letter to the provost.

The dean shall promptly inform the chair of the *primary unit evaluation committee* and the department chair of the dean's recommendation.

- iii. **UCDF-7 Form.** This form shall be completed and signed by the appropriate administrators at each level and is sent to the provost's office or it is sent to the provost's office to be sent for electronic signatures once the review is completed.
- iv. **Final Review.** The dean shall review the dossier to ensure all relevant information has been included and shall submit the electronic dossier to the provost's office by the first of February or a different date determined by the provost's office.

- v. At the conclusion of the *first level review*, the Dean's office will provide to the candidate copies of all review letters in the *first level review*.

G. The Vice Chancellor's *Review Committee* (beginning of *second level review*)

1. Membership

The vice chancellor's *review committee* (VCRC) shall consist of one representative from the Colleges of Business, Education, Engineering, Nursing and Health Sciences, and the School of Public Affairs, and three representatives from the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences (one from each of the arts and humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences). In addition, the library will have an *ad hoc* representative on the VCRC in years when it has a candidate under review.

Members of the VCRC will be recommended following governance processes in the respective schools, colleges, and the library, with final selection and appointment by the provost.

Whenever possible, all members of the VCRC will be tenured full professors. When a unit is unable to nominate a full professor for the VCRC, the unit may be represented by a tenured associate professor, who will not participate in discussion or voting on cases involving promotion to professor. When possible, the committee will include broad socio-demographic representation.

2. VCRC Role and Responsibilities, and Recommendations

The VCRC assists with the campus level review of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The committee is advisory to the provost. The committee selects its chair through majority vote.

The VCRC is responsible for reviewing and evaluating all dossiers and making recommendations for all tenure-track candidates for comprehensive reappointment, promotion and tenure, tenure, and all tenured candidates for promotion. The committee makes individual and collective judgments. The committee is guided by the standards, criteria, and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion specified in the *primary unit* criteria, Laws of the Regents and APS 1022 Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review.

Members of the VCRC must not have a conflict of interest or have a predetermined position on any candidates for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

The VCRC shall conduct a full review of all candidates and makes recommendations to the provost on the following personnel actions:

- Comprehensive reappointment review required of each tenure-track assistant professor and associate professor without tenure prior to the award of tenure
- Promotion to associate professor and professor
- Award of tenure.

The VCRC convenes early in the fall semester to establish its calendar of meetings. All VCRC recommendations must be submitted to the provost prior to the middle of March or by a different date as determined by the provost.

Prior to all VCRC meetings at which candidate dossiers are considered, the chair shall assign specific dossiers to each committee member. Although all committee members review and evaluate all dossiers, the members with specific dossier assignments present those cases to the committee. The presenter is always from a department or area different from that of the candidate. After deliberation, the committee shall vote on each candidate and prepare a recommendation to the provost. The vote and members present must be included in the recommendation. In the case of a non-unanimous decision, a minority opinion should be included.

If the VCRC disagrees with the recommendation of the dean or the *primary unit* faculty, the provost shall transmit to the dean the nature of the disagreement in writing. If the disagreement is with the *primary unit* faculty, the *primary unit evaluation committee* shall be informed and will have the opportunity to reconsider the case. Any reconsidered judgment, including the results of any additional votes, shall be transmitted to the dean and the provost in writing. The dean will then have an opportunity to reconsider the case and also transmit any reconsidered judgment to the provost in writing. If the VCRC agrees with the *primary unit* but disagrees with the dean, the dean shall have the opportunity to reconsider the case and transmit any reconsidered judgment to the provost in writing. Any disagreement must be based on the *primary unit* criteria, Laws of the Regents and APS 1022 Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review.

H. Role of the Office of the Provost

The Office of the provost is responsible for administering the RPT process, including preparing the dossier templates, establishing the RPT calendar, scheduling VCRC meetings, and recording the votes and recommendations of the VCRC for each case considered.

I. Decisions by the Provost

The VCRC's recommendations are forwarded to the provost, who shall review the dossiers and recommendations and shall make a decision on each case. If the provost disagrees either with the recommendation of the VCRC or that of the dean, the nature of the disagreement is transmitted either to the VCRC or to the dean in writing. The dean and the VCRC shall then reconsider their recommendation and return their reconsidered judgment(s) to the provost. The decision made by the provost constitutes the final stage of the second level of review and is forwarded to the chancellor for the final recommendation.

If the provost finds significant procedural errors that may have affected the outcome of the case, they may return the case to the *primary unit* to repeat the process. The provost may, at their discretion, appoint a responsible party to oversee the process to ensure procedural integrity and fairness to the candidate. If it is determined that the repetition of the process will carry forward into the next academic year, the provost may extend the contract of the candidate by one year. The re-evaluation process shall focus on the record as it existed at the time of the first review.

A summary report of the decisions on cases considered for tenure is provided to the President's Office. Except in cases of appeals to the president by the candidate, this report constitutes the campus contribution to the *third level review*.

The provost's office will provide the candidate with the results of the *second level review* in writing at the conclusion of the *second level review*. For cases which include review by the Board of Regents, the provost's office will inform the candidate of the results of Regent review.

J. Decisions by the Chancellor

The chancellor's decision in RPT cases is the final and presiding one. If the recommendations of the VCRC and the provost are different, the chancellor will meet with the provost and the VCRC to hear distinguishing points of view. In cases where the chancellor disagrees with the dean, VCRC, or provost, the chancellor shall provide written justification for their decision.

K. Post-decision processes

The provost shall prepare a letter apprising each candidate of the decision, noting strengths and weaknesses identified in the evaluation process. All negative decisions are communicated to the dean and the VCRC. Notice of the decision normally will be provided to each candidate by the end of the academic year. If a candidate so requests, the provost shall advise the candidate of the reasons that contributed to a negative recommendation.

In the case of a negative decision, the faculty member, within ten days of receipt of written notice of denial for tenure from the provost, may request review by the president. The president may review at the initiation of the faculty member a negative decision regarding reappointment or promotion. Specific requirements regarding review of a negative decision and subsequent grievance procedures are described in APS 1022.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. *First Level Review* - This term refers to the Dean of the school or college to which the recommendations of the *primary unit* are taken. Without regard to the size of the school or college, the Dean shall not participate as a member of the *primary unit* but rather shall carry out the independent duties of the office specified by the Board of Regents.

B. *Primary Unit* - This term refers to the academic unit composed of professional colleagues most directly involved with the candidate and having authority to make recommendations concerning appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In schools and colleges with departmental organizations, each department will typically be a *primary unit*. In a school or college without such organization all full-time faculty members shall have the responsibility for developing the terms of their own working structure whereby the *primary unit* is defined. The *primary unit* may be a division, or may be the school or college as a whole. In some instances the *primary unit* may involve cognate departments or institutes. The Dean of the school or college and the chief academic officer shall be informed in writing of the determined structure of the *primary unit*. Only members of the *primary unit* holding tenure shall vote on decisions relating to tenure, except that non-tenured members of the *primary unit* may be permitted to vote on decisions relating to tenure when authorized by the Dean of the school or college and the chief academic officer when circumstances, in their discretion, so justify.

C. *Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC)* - This term refers to the group within the *primary unit* that is delegated by the *primary unit* the responsibility of initially reviewing the qualifications of candidates for appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In a small *primary unit*, all members of the unit may

constitute such a committee. Evaluators who will review candidates at later stages of the review process shall not serve on *primary unit evaluation committees*.

D. *Review Committee* - This term refers to the faculty group that assists the dean in the first level review procedures.

E. *Second Level Review* - This term refers to the chief academic officer of a campus to whom the recommendations of the *primary unit*, the Dean, and the *review committee* are taken.

F. *Tenure* - This term refers to faculty appointments that continue until termination by resignation, retirement, or otherwise pursuant to applicable regent laws and policies.

G. *Third Level Review* - This term refers to the president of the University to whom the recommendations and decisions of the chief academic officer of the campus are taken.

IV. RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FORMS, GUIDELINES, AND OTHER RESOURCES

- A. Administrative Policy Statements (APS) and Other Policies
 - a. APS 1022 Standards, Processes and Procedures for Reappointment Promotion and Post-Tenure Review.
 - b. APS 1045 Transfer of a Tenured Appointment
 - c. APS 5060 Faculty Appointments
 - d. UCCS policy 300-006 Disclosure and Management of Conflicts of Interest or Commitment
- B. Procedures
- C. Forms
 - 1. Recommended Vita Format
 - 2. UCDF-7 Summary of Recommendation and Notification of Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
- D. Guidelines
- E. Other Resources (i.e. training, secondary contact information)
- F. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

V. HISTORY

Initial policy approval	May 20, 2003
Revised	August 16, 2004
Revised	February 13, 2006
Revised	March 3, 2008
Revised	October 7, 2009
Revised	October 28, 2022

**Recommended
VITA FORMAT**

1. **Name**
2. **Education** (list all degrees, years at each institution, and post-doc training)
3. **Professional Experience** (list all titles, institutions, dates)
4. **Refereed Publications, Galleries, Performances, etc.** (in reverse chronological order) (Note: The words “in press” are strictly confined to those where the author has received a letter from the journal editor indicating that the paper has been accepted for publication or that the paper has been accepted for publication with revisions. If the author has received a letter from the editor that the author may wish to revise and resubmit the article for consideration, the situation does not constitute using the words “in press.” In the latter situation, the author should indicate “publication submitted.”)
 - a. Categories will depend on discipline. Galleries and performances included in this section should be in reverse chronological order and should only be those where peer review or screening was involved.
 - b. In press and defined publications should be listed. Authors names or order of authors should be listed as they appear in publication including volume number, issue number (if appropriate), and page numbers.
5. **Non-Refereed Publications, Galleries, Performances, etc.**
Reverse chronology including meeting abstracts, proceedings, etc., technical reports, popular articles, or other galleries and performances.
6. **Publications/Creative Works Submitted**
Indicate whether papers are under review, being revised, and under second review. Cite journal, and submission date. Indicate scheduled galleries and performances.
7. **Books and Book Chapters**
8. **Published Reviews (books, articles, plays, other creative works)**
9. **Presentations at Meetings and Seminars Presented**
List in reverse chronological order with authors, and name of organization.
10. **Grants and Scholarship**
 - a. List the amount, date, agency, title of grant, and the role of author.
 - b. List proposals submitted; indicate status (denied, under review, pending).
 - c. Other indicators (both internal and external) of the quality of your scholarly and creative work; citations of papers; reviews of your works; purchases of your works by museums, reviewer of other people’s scholarly works, etc.
11. **Courses Taught**
Indicate title of course, level of course (graduate or undergraduate) (number of times taught is optional).
12. **Recognitions**
13. **Professional Organizations**
14. **Service and Leadership**
Department, college/school/library, and University committees and activities, including faculty governance. State and national government agencies. Accreditation and program review site visits. Committees of professional societies or associations; session chair at professional meetings. Consulting.